- WILLIAMS, J. R. (1958a). Studies on the nematode soil fauna of sugar cane fields in Mauritius. 1. The genus Mononchus (Trilobidae, Enoplida). Mauritius Sugar Ind. Res. Inst. Occ. paper no. 1, 1-13.
- ---- (1958b). Studies on the nematode soil fauna of sugar cane fields in Mauritius. 2. Belondiridae (Dorylaimoidea, Enoplida). Ebenda no. 2, 1-9.
- --- (1959). Studies on the nematode soil fauna of sugar cane fields in Mauritius. 3. Dorylaimidae (Dorylaimoidea, Enoplida). Ebenda no. 3, 1-28.
- ----- (1960). Studies on the nematode soil fauna of sugar cane fields in Mauritius. 4. Tylenchoidea (*partim*). Ebenda no. 4, 1-30.

Mary T. FRANKLIN¹): Antirrhinum not a host of Heterodera rostochiensis.

Antirrhinum majus L. has twice been recorded as host of Heterodera rostochiensis Woll. (Franklin, 1951; T. Goodey, 1956). Both records were based on the same material consisting of dried roots bearing young Heterodera cysts, collected in 1935 by E. Holmes Smith near Blackpool, England. The material has been re-examined because the absence of other records of this commonly grown plant as host, and the failure of Winslow (1954) to get H. rostochiensis to infest three species of Antirrhinum, threw doubt on the validity of the original observation.

The cysts are spherical, some pale yellow, others light brown. The positions of the anus and the vulval fenestra are normal for *H. rostochiensis*, and the ratio of the distance from anus to lip of fenestra divided by the diameter of the fenestra (Granek's ratio) falls well within the values given by Jones (1962) for several British populations. For ten specimens it ranges from 1.8-4.5 with a mean of 3.25, and is below 3.0 in only three specimens. There is therefore no reason for thinking that the cysts are not *H. rostochiensis*.

Pieces of the dried roots sent to the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, have been identified as belonging to the Solanaceae and are definitely not Antirrhinum.

It can therefore be stated that this record of *H. rostochiensis* on *Antirrhinum majus* is incorrect because the roots were wrongly identified.

I thank the Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens for examining the roots.

- FRANKLIN, M. T. (1951). The Cyst-forming species of Heterodera. Comm. agric. Bur., Farnham Royal, 147 pp. (see p. 113).
- GOODEY, T. (1956). The nematode parasites of plants catalogued under their hosts. Revised edition by J. B. Goodey & M. T. Franklin; Comm. agric. Bur., Farnham Royal, 140 pp. (see p. 11).

JONES, F. G. W. (1962). A note on Granek's ratio for the separation of *Heterodera rostochiensis* W. from *H. tabacum* L. & L. Nematologica 7, 256-258.

WINSLOW, R. D. (1954). Provisional lists of host plants of some root eelworms (Heterodera spp.). Ann. appl. Biol. 41, 591-605.

R. S. PITCHER & A. F. POSNETTE²): Vascular feeding by Xiphinema diversicaudatum (Micol.).

In their review of virus transmission by nematodes, Raski & Hewitt (1963) point out that little is known about the root tissues on which Dorylaimid nematodes feed. While attempting to assess feeding times, as distinct from "access times", in the study of arabis mosaic virus transmission, we obtained evidence that the stylet of the dagger nematode *Xiphinema diversicaudatum* can penetrate the vascular tissue of roots.

Petunia hybrida seedlings were grown in washed sand (14 mesh) in either glass tubes (Jha & Posnette, 1961), or containers made of two microscope slides spaced 3 mm apart. The glass was

¹⁾ Rothamsted Experimental Station, Harpenden, Herts, England.

²) East Malling Research Station, Maidstone, Kent, England.